

SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

September 27, 2000
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

#	Agenda Items	Presenters
❖	New Commissioner Announcement	Scott Trimble
❖	Selection Process and Appointment of New Deputy	Scott Trimble
❖	Status of New Appointment to SCAAC	Scott Trimble
❖	New Chair	Scott Trimble
❖	Future Meeting Date	Benny Lile
1.	Meeting Minutes	Benny Lile
2.	Teacher Qualifications – School Report Card	Scott Trimble
3.	KCCT Data Release	Scott Trimble
4.	Rewards	Cindy Owen
5.	Waivers	Cindy Owen
6.	Review of Reports	Scott Trimble
7.	Percentiles – Reporting CTBS Data	Scott Trimble
8.	Student Accountability	Scott Trimble
9.	Motivation Research – NTAPAA	Linda Frazer
10.	Standard Setting	Scott Trimble
11.	Longitudinal Study	Scott Trimble

12.	Validation and Research's Scope of Work	Linda Frazer
13.	Minority Student Achievement Task Force	Lois Adams-Rodgers
Adjournment		

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
September 27, 2000

Chairman Benny Lile called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. EST. The roll was called.

Members Present:

Dale Campbell	Benny Lile	Nancy Sutton
Kay Freeland	Bob Sexton	Maynard Thomas
Suzanne Guyer	Linda Sheffield	Sharon Whitworth
Maxie Johnson		

❖ **New Commissioner Announcement**

Scott Trimble

Beginning October 1, Gene Wilhoit will be the new Commissioner of Education in the Department of Education (KDE).

❖ **Selection Process and Appointment of New Deputy**

Scott Trimble

There are no pre-selected candidates. An advertisement will be made public, and the regular employment procedures will be followed. It is an open process. The position will be advertised statewide and nationally. The Commissioner makes the employment decision.

❖ **Status of New Appointment to SCAAC**

Scott Trimble

There is no news of new appointments. Members are requested to serve until the Governor makes new appointments.

❖ **New Chair**

Scott Trimble

The question was asked of Council members: Does the Council want to wait to name a new chair until new members have been appointed or would they like to do it now?

Kay Freeland made a motion to have Benny Lile remain as Chair until new members are appointed. Maynard Thomas seconded the motion. The Council voted and the motion passed.

❖ **Future Meeting Dates**

Benny Lile

November 29, 2000

January 31, 2001

March 28, 2001

1. Meeting Minutes

Benny Lile

On page 10, the cost of virtual HS classes needs to be edited. Classes are more than \$20 a person. Strike the information and state that classes are fee-based. Classes are opened to 8th graders as well. This addition needs to be made.

On page 3, the text goes from third person to first person. Consistency needs to be maintained and if first person is used, the person needs to be identified.

If a motion is made and seconded, individuals should be identified; otherwise, comments should be attributed to the Council.

Page 3 Number 1, "AD" should be spelled correctly.

A motion was made to approve the minutes as corrected by Suzanne Guyer. Nancy Sutton seconded the motion. The Council voted and the motion passed.

2. Teacher Qualifications – School Report Card

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

The Kentucky Board of Education met and discussed the issue of teacher qualifications reported on the School Report Card. The Counsel's view was presented at the Board meeting. In general, the Counsel supported the inclusion of this information.

SCAAC Comments/Question:

This data should be used as an indicator. If a school has a high index, maybe it's not as critical that all or a large percent of teachers have majors or minors. The question arises that if students in a school are not performing well and on the School Report Card data shows that only a small percentage of teachers have majors or minors in the areas they teach, what should the data mean? It may mean something different if the school is performing well.

An article by Amy Wilkins, out of Washington DC, was mentioned. It was reported that the article reflects a lot of research that students do better when taught by a teacher having a major or minor. The research needs to be located. Staff from the Division of Validation and Research will try to get a copy of the research and bring back to the Council at the next meeting. The Kentucky Board of Education left the cell reflecting the percent of teachers with majors or minors in the content area taught intact in the regulation and gave final approval. A public hearing was scheduled, but there was no input and no one signed up to speak. There are potentially two other steps for the regulation to go through. Both the Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee (EAARS) and the Interim Joint Education Subcommittee can comment on the regulation. If these groups do not review the regulation, it will become final. If they do comment, the Kentucky Board of Education will consider the comments at their December meeting.

Local education agencies are having a difficult time locating teachers with math majors and minors. There is a shortage of math majors, which presents a serious problem. Rank IV and substitutes are being used.

KDE Response:

The department is interested in these comments and needs to be cognizant of the fact that this data is being required to be on the School Report Card, even though there is difficulty in finding staff to fill the positions needed.

SCAAC Concerns:

The use of emergency staff is a concern and should be reflected in the academic performance of students. There is also a concern about the cumulative effect of using emergency certified staff as we move through the K-12 system. The Council is not taking issue with the data required to be on the School Report Card, but is expressing the concern that staff are difficult to find. The long-term impact of accountability will be important to monitor. Information is needed on what districts are doing to recruit teachers in the area of mathematics as well as what is being done for professional development. An option might be to ask people in these positions to get involved in seeking certification and/or professional development in the area they are teaching on emergency certificates. However, time and costs are concerns for people in these positions. Districts may need to seek information on endorsement programs or extensions for certification. In addition, long-term solutions need more attention. Mathematics is not the only content area where it's difficult to employ certified teachers. Other areas include science, foreign language, and special education. Districts see the

problem as a looming crisis. It's a K-12 issue. The problem exists across the nation. A few states do have a surplus of teachers, and those teachers are being recruited from other states. Some states are offering incentives for teachers (i.e., townhouses) to seek employment in their school districts. Kentucky may need to recruit differently, but may also have to pay teachers more.

This issue is much bigger than what this council can solve. Until the legislature and citizens value teachers, this will continue to be a problem. It is a problem that began long ago. If everyone gets to 100, class sizes need to be reduced and special populations need to be assisted. Until changes are made at the legislative level in terms of funding and class size, the problem cannot be solved.

Mentoring programs for students to encourage students to enter the teaching field may need to be established. Some high schools offer a class for students interested in education. This may become more important as more and more teachers are being lost to private competition.

The impact on accountability needs to be monitored. It cannot be answered today, but there has to be an impact on accountability. Credibility of the accountability program is a concern.

KDE Response:

The impact on accountability needs to be reviewed in conjunction with the scope of work in the Division of Validation & Research. Teacher information and its effect on student performance need to be collected. The department staff will discuss this with staff in the Division of Validation and Research to see if this can be reviewed.

SCAAC Concerns:

The turnover problem contributes to this. If there were no turnover problems, there would be no recruitment problems. It is difficult to recruit without incentives to offer. In some districts, pay is not the major influence in teachers changing districts, but in others, teachers are being recruited by other states because of salaries.

Teachers are being asked to do more and more with no more teacher preparation time. This issue needs to be reviewed. Four professional development (PD) days are not enough. Scheduling PD days should be addressed. Establishing these days before a long break does not encourage people to take them seriously. Days are more effectively used if they are scheduled throughout the year, and ways to pull in more time in meaningful ways is being looked at.

The Council requests that staff from the Professional Standards Board, Teacher Certification, and the Kentucky Education Association (KEA) attend the next the Council meeting and provide information on teacher certification, emergency certificates, and recruitment. KEA needs to provide information on what it would take to recruit teachers.

3. KCCT Data Release

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

The 2000 Assessment Reports arrived in districts on schedule (by September 15th). The department has tried to get the data out as early as possible. The data is embargoed until 9:00 a.m., September 28th. The process is working well. Reports are going out on time, and schools/districts are having time to review data before public receives it.

Disaggregated data will be available in hard copy after the embargo but not available on the Web until the department staff has the chance to post it. School data (aggregate data) will be on the Web tomorrow. Schools have received disaggregated data for the Kentucky Core Content Test as well as for CTBS.

School-Based Decision Making (SBDM) council members have access to the data but cannot discuss it in public meetings until the embargo is lifted.

SCAAC Comments:

Shipping alphabetically needs to be reviewed, and a varied approach needs to be considered. Shipping alphabetically results in the same districts getting their reports later than others every year.

KDE Response:

After the process reaches a point of smooth operation, this and other improvements can be considered.

SCAAC Comments:

Members agree that it is very helpful to have data as early as it was received this year. Staff is able to review data and prepare for the public release.

4. Rewards

Cindy Owen

Presentation Overview: Since 1994, every year that rewards have been distributed, the Department of Education has calculated and awarded the maximum amount allowed by regulation (i.e., 1.75% of the amount of funds paid to certified personnel within Kentucky's public schools during the last year of the accountability cycle). Every year \$10 million plus interest is deposited into the reward fund. After reviewing the account and calculating reward projections from 2000 through 2014, it was determined that at the maximum rate of distribution the account would become deplete prior to 2014. To begin to address this, further projections were calculated and possible solutions discussed by staff in the Department and some financial analysts. As a result, a staff note was written and is being presented to the Kentucky Board of Education at their meeting in October. Two options are included in the staff note:

Option 1: The Kentucky Board of Education can place a cap on the amount of money to distributed for rewards. To ensure the reward program is sustained through 2014, this cap would need to be set at about \$22 million.

Option 2: The Kentucky Board of Education can recommend to the legislature that funding be increased to allow distribution of the maximum amount allowed by regulation. This would require legislative action.

Reward money will be distributed for the biennium ending in 2000. The process for determining the number of certified staff employed on the last working day of the 1999-2000 school year in each reward school and their corresponding FTEs will be the same as for the last reward distribution.

A Reward Toolkit is being written and scheduled for distribution in November to assist reward schools with processing details.

5. Waivers

Cindy Owen

Presentation Overview:

703 KAR 5:020 Section 4 (1) states: *“For the Kentucky Core Content Test, if a school does not have grades four (4) and five (5) at the elementary level, grades seven (7) and eight (8) at the middle school, or grades ten (10), eleven (11), and twelve (12) at the high school, the school shall be combined with the school or schools having the missing grades(s) its students previously attended or would subsequently attend, forming a single school accountability unit.”*

Section 4 (2) goes on to say: “A school that does not contain a grade at which the national norm-referenced test is administered shall have its accountability index calculated using only the weights specified as component one (1) of the index in Section 3 of this administrative regulation. Schools that have more than one (1) grade at which the national norm-referenced test is administered shall have those grades combined to form the basis for component two (2) of the calculations described in Section 3 of this administrative regulation.”

Section 4(3) states: “A school or school district may request a waiver of the requirements of subsections (1) and (2) of this section or from the normal configuration of schools (elementary, middle, or high school) from the Kentucky Board of Education specifying other combinations of schools and assessment data if all students in an accountability grade are included, and all schools are accountable for all content areas assessed...”

Based on this regulatory language, a primary school that houses P1 through P3 would have the same performance judgment as the school its students would subsequently attend. The performance judgment would be based on calculations using data generated at the receiving school and would not include the norm reference test data

from P3 unless the school or school district requests a waiver that would include this data. The same would be true of a 9th grade center that feeds into a high school.

A staff note is being submitted to the Kentucky Board of Education at the October meeting that requests waivers for several primary schools and one 9th grade center based on this regulatory language.

6. Review of Reports

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

The following report forms were distributed for review and comment.

- Spring 1999 Kentucky Core Content Test - Individual Student Report
- Kentucky Core Content Test Spring 1999 - Student Listing
- Kentucky Core Content Test Spring 1999 - Student Item Level Report
- Kentucky Core Content Test Spring 2000 - Core Content Report
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - Academic Trend Data
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - Reading Trend Data
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - Reading Sub-scores
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - On-Demand Writing Trend Data
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - Writing Portfolio Trend Data
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - 10th-11th Grade Data Disaggregation
- Spring 2000 Kentucky Performance Report - Summary Data and Descriptive Statistics
- Kentucky Performance Report - Interim Accountability Cycle (Preliminary) Spring 2000

SCAAC Question:

What is happening with released items?

KDE Response:

In the future, we hope that we can have released items, but currently the item pool does not support the release of items.

7. Percentiles – Reporting CTBS Data

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

CTBS data is reported to the public as national percentiles. This has been discussed with this council in the past. Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) were considered for a reporting unit. The advice of this council was to report in percentiles. The National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) agreed with the Council, and that is how data was reported. Standardized scores, such as percentiles, did not work like most people would have liked when reporting data to the public. When summary test data are reported in percentile, the mean performance is typically

converted to the national percentile based on the distribution of student scores when the test was standardized. Therefore, a mean scale score or Normal Curve Equivalents might equate to the 30th, 40th percentiles, etc. When you look at data across time and put trend percentiles in perspective, a school moving from the 30th to the 40th percentile moved more on the underlying measurement scale than a school that moved from the 45th to the 55th percentile. This issue was reviewed again with National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability, and it was recommended that percentiles continue to be used and communication strengthened so that the standard error of estimate is reported.

SCAAC Comment:

Continue to report in percentiles.

How will the CTBS/5 be included in accountability beginning with the baselines for the long-term accountability process?

KDE Response

(While the topic of how the CTBS/5 will be included in accountability was not originally on the agenda, the question was raised from the discussion of reporting CTBS/5 in percentile units. The Council was interested in better understanding the current proposal.)

Questions about whether standards for the CTB should be set like those for KCCT arose, and advice was given by National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability -- that this not be done and an alternative way be sought for inclusion. Assessments were different enough in terms of both content and in complexity/difficulty that this advice was given.

In the process of reviewing the Norm Reference Tests (NRT) proposed for use in the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS), a committee of Kentucky teachers concluded that NRT addressed about 30 to 40 percent of the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment, and did not address adequately measurement of application and higher order thinking skills.

The CTBS/5 was normed in 1996. The CTBS/5 data are currently reported in the National Percentile Scale. The proposal suggested by National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability was to simply note the percent of students in a school scoring at or above the national 50th percentile and to multiply this number by 140 to place the scale on one that is similar in range to the academic scales used on the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT). On the KCCT reading assessment, a school can be assigned a reading index ranging from 0 to 140. The proposed method would result in an index of 140 on the CTBS if 100% of the students in a school scored at or above the national 50th percentile. An index of zero would result if none scored at or above the national 50th percentile.

SCAAC Concern:

Concern was expressed that the same credit will be given for students a little above the 50th percentile as students scoring in the 90-99 percentile.

KDE Response:

NTAPAA discussed this. Teachers reviewed CTB and found that Core Content coverage was about 30%. The assessments were different enough that if performance levels were established for CTB like the KCCT, the standards could not mean the same.

There was a discussion about setting standards similar to those being set on the KCCT: Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished. This could have relied on one or all of the procedures being applied to the KCCT. This would not have worked well because of the differences in content and difficulty in the two assessments. The effort and financial resources needed to do this would not have been justified. The CTBS/5 is to count 5% in the long-term calculation. The content and difficulty differences between these assessments are some of the same reasons the CTBS/5 counts 5% as opposed to a larger amount.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Why couldn't a scale similar to Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished (NAPD) be applied to the CTBS/5 in a way similar to how it is applied to the KCCT? There was some discussion of an early proposal to apply Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished weights to the percent of students scoring in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quartiles producing a *KCCT-like* index. How do you define mastery on the content of the test as compared to the standards? Where is the proficient level? Where would it be mastery for 3rd grade students? Was it ever considered to take the school's percentile and count it as 5% rather than the way that is currently proposed?

KDE Response:

CTB doesn't assess the total scope of the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment and range of difficulty. In this situation, it would be difficult to spread the Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished (NAPD) performance levels across both assessments and obtain similar meaning and, therefore, similar instructional emphasis. The application of the NAPD weights to percents scoring in each quartile would not permit schools to approach the higher ranges in the 0-140 scale because of the perceived difficulty in pushing large portions of the scores above the 75th percentile. It is important to produce a Norm Reference Tests (NRT) component in the long-term accountability calculations that have statistical ranges and variances similar to the KCCT components. The range is of some interest in that it may make *visual* comparisons easier. The variance is of importance so as to produce an overall index in which the NRT really is a 5% factor. If the variance becomes noticeably smaller than the other KCCT academic components, the real affect of the NRT would be something less than 5%. Some would argue that because the nonacademic index has a relatively small statistical variance, it has less than its nominal weight in the overall index.

There are no perfect solutions to these concerns. The discussion has centered on instructional differences encouraged or not encouraged because of the content/mode of assessment differences between the Kentucky Core Content Test and any NRT, and on the most efficient and meaningful use of resources: both teacher time and financial resources.

All of these things were discussed, along with what other states do. The real focus for including the NRT in accountability was monitoring instruction against some national benchmark or norm, while not directing all instruction to a subset of Kentucky's core content. It's being proposed that the 50th percentile on this NRT is what we value. The Board will have the latitude to confirm or alter the point of focus.

For similar reasons, the mean performance converted to the 50th percentile was discussed, but not proposed. Some rather complex statistical transformations would need to be applied.

The issues might be:

- Should standards be set on the NRT like on the KCCT? The answer has been no because of the range of difficulties discussed.
- Should arbitrary cut points be set for NAPD? The answer is no because this would not be as defensible as setting a single point and explaining how that point is valued.
- One reason for focusing on the 50th percentile is because it is often used to describe *on grade level* performance:

SCAAC Concern/Question:

Counting the NRT 5% in the accountability index is not an issue, but how it's planned to be calculated is a real concern. For all students above the 50th percentile to count the same is of concern and for a student at the 49th percentile not to count and at the 51st to count is also a concern.

Does including the NRT (not totally based on our standards) in accountability present a technical concern?

KDE Response:

All have been balancing these concerns with the over-all weight in the model. The current plan would seem to balance the need to keep some attention on national normative scales while focusing most on the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment.

SCAAC Question:

Is it possible to simulate what the NRT calculated at 5% under various scenarios would do to a school index?

KDE Response:

Yes, and we may use Normal Curve Equivalents for some scenarios.

The department staff will develop a staff note for the December Kentucky Board of Education meeting that describes the calculations and the rationale, including the description of methods that were reviewed but not chosen and why.

8. Student Accountability

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

A staff note is being submitted to the Kentucky Board of Education in October that proposes a plan for student accountability. In general, the proposal offers a way for a student's GPA to be increased by no more than 3%.

SCAAC Comments:

If this proposal is implemented it will affect scholarships for state universities. Some believe that inequity due to advanced placement classes is adjusted for in KEES. The department staff will inquire about this and report back to the Council. The department staff needs to clarify with the Kentucky Board of Education whether or not this proposal will affect KEES. If this plan is optional and not all schools are implementing it, it should not be part of KEES.

KDE Response:

There is only a perceived equity existing now. All schools do not offer the same advanced placement classes. This proposal can only increase a student's GPA.

SCAAC Comments/Question:

If students are not getting equal instruction, how will this assist in leveling the playing field?

This may not be worth the hassle of having to calculate results into GPAs. The Council needs to consider whether or not this proposal does any harm to students and whether it addresses student accountability concerns. This proposal doesn't seem to cause harm and if it assists with student accountability concerns, it's a better plan than what has been discussed in the past. There is a concern about the labor involved from school staff for no more than this would be worth.

KDE Response:

This proposal doesn't address opportunity to learn. However, calculations of GPAs without this option are affected by the opportunity to learn. The intent of this proposal is to present an option to school staff who feel they have a student motivation problem.

9. Motivation Research – NTAPAA

Linda Frazer

The department is attempting to merge files from National Technical Advisory Panel Assessment & Accountability. Survey with the two test scores (KIRIS, CTBS). NTAPAA will analyze the data and we will have information to report later.

10. Standard Setting

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

The Standards Setting Process continues with the initial standard descriptors in draft form being used in each of the three standards setting procedures. Teachers have contributed to the Contrasting Groups Procedure and that data will be used with the 2000 test results. The remaining steps include the Jaeger-Mills Procedure that is scheduled for October 30-31, the CTB Bookmark Procedure taking place December 4-6, the synthesis step, and finally the State Board Decision.

SCAAC Question:

What did the Department do with the committee recommendation to include University staff in the Jaeger-Mills Procedure and the CTB Bookmark Procedure?

KDE Response:

National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability and others said that in order for the standards to be credible, classroom teachers should be the people involved in the steps. Others are not considered experts on what grade level and content area standards should be. There's a definition of a qualified expert on what the standard should be, say, for a 4th grade reader. Work is more defensible when the definition of the experts is more tightly set.

11. Longitudinal Study

Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:

The Longitudinal Model 2 was discussed. Current plan is to continue with the full-scale implementation of Model 2 that focuses on retesting students in reading and mathematics that perform at the novice or low apprentice levels. However, the department is receiving information from the field expressing difficulties based on the pilot conducted at the 4th/5th grade level.

The issues include:

- The purpose of longitudinal assessment must be made clear and an understanding of the intent of the role it should play in accountability must be communicated.
- Student labeling and its effect on individual student self-esteem must be addressed.

- Instructional implications should be made clear.
- A process for tracking students from one school to another or from district to district must be put in place to make the assessment possible within the resources of local school districts.

Issues raised by district assessment coordinators include:

- All students should be tested, not just the students performing at the novice and apprentice levels.
- In order to test all students, multiple choice assessment options for the longitudinal component should be reviewed.
- Testing should occur at the time currently planned (either with the regular assessment or shortly after). Earlier testing would shorten the needed instruction time interventions.

National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability agreed that these concerns were of importance and needed to be addressed. The Panel suggested that at the elementary level, all students should be tested at the End of Primary with the 4th grade Reading test. If affordable, the 8th grade math test should be administered to all 7th grade students. The Panel did not think that this assessment should be part of the accountability calculations, but perhaps a trigger for rewards.

SCAAC Question:

Why did the Panel oppose using the multiple-choice items only?

KDE Response:

Using only the multiple-choice items make it difficult to compare performance on the multiple-choice items with a test that contains multiple-choice and open-response items. The Panel thinks it should be more than just going through the motions and that the same structure and standards should be contained in both testing experiences.

SCAAC Concerns:

There is really no problem with testing just the low-performing students. If the reasons for testing were delivered correctly, students' self-esteem would not be affected. The current plan will be difficult to implement at the high school level. This could be used as an end of course test, but it won't work after students have already been promoted. The Council understands the legal requirements for the longitudinal component, but is concerned with the added pressures: both instructionally and logistically. Additional testing time is of concern. The past year assessment went rather well and this could draw attention and criticism to the program.

The Council was very concerned about any proposal to test *End of Primary* students with a 4th grade test. This would contain substantial content on which these students were not familiar.

There was concern that the End of Primary to fourth grade testing would single out individual teachers in small schools.

12. Validation and Research's Scope of Work

Linda Frazer

The Scope of Work is a living document with minuet revisions with attached management plan that shows matching tasks with recourses / personnel / budget / timelines.

13. Minority Student Achievement Task Force

**Lois
Adams-Rodgers**

Presentation Overview: The draft report of the Minority Student Achievement Task Force was distributed and discussed.

The report includes:

- A description of the Minority Student Achievement Task Force
- Belief statements of the Task Force
- Signature pages of members confirming commitment to the work
- Introduction
- Background of the Task Force
- The Barriers Document

SCAAC Comments/Question:

This is a comprehensive set of tasks. Assessment results are the gauge of this. What is the interim gauge?

KDE Response:

To improve student performance and what happens with the data is the ultimate goal, abut what is done in the interim needs to be considered. For example, how are resources re-aligned? What is happening in school districts to address these issues?

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned.